29 October 1969

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Conversation with Ed Braswell, on the staff of the Senate Armed Services Committee

- retirement legislation. I told him that Chairman Rivers had introduced our bill in the House today and I wondered about the possibility of having the bill also introduced in the Senate. Braswell said he did not agree with the policy of having identical bills in both the House and Senate. He sees no advantage, other than a psychological one, in introducing our bill in the Senate when it has already been introduced in the House.
- 2. He went on to say that Senator Stennis is opposed generally to retroactive legislation. For this reason, Braswell felt it would be in our best interest (since we want our legislation to be retroactive) to press for action in the House. The Senate could then act on the House-passed bill. He said if we saw any further need for having a bill introduced in the Senate or felt that we would not get reasonably prompt action in the House to let him know. Braswell is obviously harassed; he is devoting all of his time to working with the conferees on the Military Procurement bill and as soon as that is taken care of will move immediately to the military draft legislation.
- National Security Commission and an Office of Defense Review (S. 3024 and S. 3023) which were referred to the Senate Armed Services Committee. He said the Committee would probably request our views on these bills but he does not expect Committee action on them unless they are pushed to the wall to do so. We discussed the jurisdictional aspects of these bills which would make substantial inroads into the jurisdiction of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees and for all practical purposes put them out of business. I told Braswell that we had received letters from the House Committee on the identical House bills and would forward our reports in due course.

Distribution:

Original - Subject
Approved For Release 2007/03/06 CIAIRPP72:00337R000100150030-9